



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandra, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspho.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/347,112	07/02/1999	MIKE STEVEN BIMM	50671-P004US	3384
75	90 05/13/2004		EXAM	INER
AGILENT TECHNOLOGIES, INC			MIRZA, ADNAN M	
	RTMENT DL429 AL PROPERTY ADMIN	ISTRATION	ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER	
P.O. BOX 7599			2141	
LOVELAND, (CO 80537-0599		DATE MAILED: 05/13/2004	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

8

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	\sim			
Advisory Action	09/347,112	BIMM ET AL.	4			
, tancer, tremen	Examiner	Art Unit				
`	Adnan M Mirza	2141				
-The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the	correspondence add	ress			
THE REPLY FILED 19 April 2004 FAILS TO PLACE THI Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to average final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	oid abandonment of this applic at timely filed amendment whic	ation. A proper reply h places the applica	y to a tion in			
PERIOD FOR RE	EPLY [check either a) or b)]					
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire to ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The	Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF T	ig date of the final rejection. HE FINAL REJECTION.	on. See MPEP			
fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 C	of extension and the corresponding amount the shortened statutory period for reply be later than three months after the ma	ount of the fee. The appropriate originally set in the final	opriate extension Office action; or			
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR	•					
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be	ecause:					
(a) they raise new issues that would require further	er consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);				
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);						
(c) they are not deemed to place the application in issues for appeal; and/or	n better form for appeal by mate	erially reducing or sir	nplifying the			
(d) they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.						
NOTE:						
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject	ion(s):					
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	be allowable if submitted in a so	eparate, timely filed	amendment			
5. ☑ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☑ request for application in condition for allowance because: See		idered but does NO	T place the			
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered becaraised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	ause it is not directed SOLELY	to issues which were	enewly			
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendments explanation of how the new or amended claims we			ind an			
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:						
Claim(s) allowed:						
Claim(s) objected to:						
Claim(s) rejected: 1-75.						
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:						
8. The drawing correction filed on is a) appr	oved or b) disapproved by t	he Examiner.				
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statemen	nt(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s).					
10. ☐ Other:						
-						

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant argued that prior art did not disclose the generic service request format " is generic to a plurality of services having a plurality of vendors or version numbers". As to applicant's argument Elliot disclosed the service ordering deployment, Provisioning, Quality of service agreements, and quality of service monitoring are in the ISP Service Management service layer. Customers will have a restricted view of the SM layer to monitor and control their services. The SM layer provides a manager that interacts with the agents in the NLMs (Elliot, col. 45, lines 15-26). One ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention can be interpreted those services as generic services.

RUPAL DHARIA SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER